

Applicant : Arnold, et al.  
Serial No. : 10/816,582  
Filed : March 31, 2004  
Page : 17 of 22

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-636001 / P589

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheets of drawings include changes to FIGS. 1, 2, 3A, 3B, 8A, 8B, 8C, 9D and 10 and replace the original sheets including FIGS. 1, 2, 3A, 3B, 8A-1, 8A-2, 8B-1, 8B-2, 8C, 9D and 10.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheets (9 pages)  
Annotated Sheets Showing Change(s) (9 pages)

## REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 11, 13, 22, 23, 25, 34 and 35 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1-36 stand rejected. The applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in, and requests reconsideration of, the action mailed October 3, 2006, in view of the amendments and remarks herein.

### **I. Objections to the Drawings**

Replacement sheets including FIGS 1, 2, 3A and 3B are submitted herewith including the legend "Prior Art" as requested by the Examiner.

The specification is amended at page 20, line 2, to include the reference number 809.

With respect to the Type1 font and TrueType font, the applicant draws the Examiner's attention to FIGS. 5 and 11A. FIG. 5 shows the letter "R" in Adobe Type 1 font Cronos MM. FIG. 11A shows the letter "R" in the TrueType Arial MT font. Accordingly, examples of these font types are included in the drawings and the features of the invention specified in the claims are shown.

### **II. Objections to the Specification**

The Examiner objected to the summary. The applicant respectfully traverses the objection. Per the section of the MPEP referenced by the Examiner, MPEP § 608.01(d) and 37 C.F.R. 1.73, a summary should be "commensurate with the invention as claimed". The Examiner asserts that the summary is essentially a rewording of the claims as a whole. That may be the case, but in any event it is commensurate with the invention as claimed, and the applicant respectfully submits the summary is consistent with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.73.

The Examiner objected to the disclosure with respect to the following informalities, which the applicant has remedied as indicated below:

1. Reference numeral 918: FIG. 9D as originally filed included reference numeral 918. The formal drawing erroneously changed 918 to 913. A replacement sheet is transmitted herewith to correct FIG. 9D to delete 913 and replace it with 918.
2. Reference numeral 1000: FIG. 10 is amended to include reference numeral 1000, which is referred to in the specification at p. 17, line 3.

3. Reference numeral 803: FIG. 8A is amended to include reference numeral 803, which is referred to in the specification at p. 19, line 24.

4. Reference numeral 842: FIG. 8C is amended to include reference numeral 842, which is referred to in the specification at page 21, line 23.

5. Reference numerals 853, 855 and 857: The specification is amended at page 23, line 32 to clarify that the range 852-858 was intended to refer to reference numerals 852, 854, 856 and 858 only.

6. Rows 1-5: The Examiner rejected the reference in the specification at p. 23, line 32 to "rows 1-5." The applicant respectfully submits that as FIG. 8B, which is being described in the sentences preceding the "rows 1-5" reference, is a table formed of columns and rows, that one can clearly understand that referring to rows 1-5 means the first through fifth rows of the table included in FIG. 8B.

7. FIGS. 3, 8A and 8B: The reference to FIG. 3 at page 2, lines 31 has been amended to read FIG. 3A. FIGS 8A-1 and 8A-2 have been amended to their original identification of FIG. 8A and FIG. 8A (cont'd) as was included in the informal drawings. Similarly, FIGS 8B-1 and 8B-2 have been amended to their original identification of FIG. 8B and FIG. 8B (cont'd) as was included in the informal drawings.

8. The typo "... has as ..." on page 10, line 20 has been amended.

9. Reference numeral 804: The applicant notes that reference numeral 804 was mistakenly used to refer to both a column and a row in FIG. 8A. The specification at p. 11, line 24 has been amended to refer to reference numeral 807 and FIG. 8A has been amended accordingly.

### **III. Objections to the Claims**

1. The Examiner objected to claims 9, 19 and 29 as including the trademark "TrueType". The applicant believes the Examiner meant to object to claims 9, 21 and 33. "The presence of a trademark or trade name in a claim is not, *per se*, improper under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, but the claim should be carefully analyzed to determine how the mark or name is used in the claim" (MPEP, § 2173.05(u)). TrueType is an outline font standard originally

developed by Apple Computer. The standard of the TrueType font is adhered to in many products. The meaning is well known and the claims can be understood by one skilled in the art. The applicant respectfully submits the claims 9, 19 and 29 are allowable.

2. The Examiner objected to claims 8, 18 and 28 as including the possible trademark "Type 1 font" in the claims. The applicant believes the Examiner meant to object to claims 8, 20 and 32. The applicant respectfully submits the argument presented above in relation to the TrueType font applies equally to the Type 1 font, which was developed by Adobe Incorporated. The meaning is well known and the claims can be understood by one skilled in the art. The applicant respectfully submits the claims 8, 20 and 32 are allowable.

#### **IV. The § 101 Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and asserted the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner further asserted that the claims consist solely of data manipulation and no tangible result is produced. The Examiner suggested that displaying the result on a display device produces a tangible result.

Independent claims 1, 10, 11, 13, 22, 23, 25, 34 and 35 have been amended to include a limitation wherein a representation of a glyph or a stroke (depending on the claim) is provided on a display device. The applicant respectfully submits the amendments overcome the Examiner's rejection of non-statutory subject matter, as a tangible result – the providing of a representation of the glyph or stroke on a display device – is clearly provided.

#### **V. The § 102 Rejections**

Claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,929,866 ("Arnold").

Claim 11, as amended, recites a computer-implemented method as set forth below:

11. A computer-implemented method, comprising:
  - receiving a plurality of glyphs to be rendered;
  - for each glyph, before rasterizing a representation of the glyph, using a scaled stem width of the glyph to select a rendering policy for rendering the glyph, where a rendering policy comprises a plurality of parameters for rendering the glyph including a hinting policy; and
  - providing a representation of the glyph on a display device.

The scaled stem width of a glyph to be rendered is used to select a rendering policy for rendering the glyph. A rendering policy is a plurality of parameters for rendering the glyph and includes a hinting policy. Arnold does not describe using a scaled stem width of the glyph to select a rendering policy. Arnold describes using a scaled stroke width to calculate an index (see Col. 6, lines 52-56). The index is used in conjunction with an original density value to select an adjusted density value, for example, from a table (see Fig. 6). A rendering policy is not selected, where a rendering policy includes a plurality of parameters to render the glyph and more particularly includes a hinting policy. Accordingly, the limitation is not disclosed in Arnold, and Arnold does not anticipate claim 11. Claim 12 depends from claim 11 and is allowable for at least the same reason. The above comments apply equally to independent claims 23 and 35, which are therefore also in condition for allowance. Claims 24 and 36 depend from claims 23 and 35 respectively, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

#### **VI. The Double Patenting Rejection**

The Examiner provisionally rejected claim 1 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of co-pending US Patent Application No. 10/816,587, having a common assignee. For the purpose of expediting prosecution, and without prejudice, the applicant hereby submits a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome the provisional rejection. The applicant submits that claim 1 is therefore in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Please deduct \$120.00 from deposit account 06-1050 for a one-month extension of time. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Arnold, et al.  
Serial No. : 10/816,582  
Filed : March 31, 2004  
Page : 22 of 22

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-636001 / P589

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 5, 2007 \_\_\_\_\_

/Brenda M. Leeds Binder/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Brenda M. Leeds Binder  
Reg. No. 57,520

**Customer No. 21876**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50323359.doc